

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,996	12/28/2001	Ulf Mattsson	10400-000001/US	1079

26161 7590 07/01/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
225 FRANKLIN ST
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
FIELDS, COURTNEY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/034,996	MATTSSON, ULF	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Courtney D. Fields	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 December 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/28/01,12/30/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

HL

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Information Disclosure Statement respectfully submitted on 28 December 2001 and 30 December 2004 have been considered by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 6-8 are objected to because of the following informalities: The term "on" should be replaced with the correct term "one". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rowland (US Patent No. 6,405,318).

Regarding claim 1, Rowland discloses a method for detecting intrusion in a database managed by an access control system comprising:

defining at least one intrusion detection profile, each including at least one item access rate associating each user with one of the defined profiles, receiving a query from a user, determining whether a result of the query exceeds any one of the item

access rates defined in the profile associated with the user and notifying the access control system, upon determining that the result exceeds any one of the at least one item access rates defined in the associated profile, to alter user authorization, thereby making the received requested query an unauthorized request, before the result of the query is transmitted to the user (See Column 3, lines 33-67, Column 4, lines 1-67, Column 5, lines 1-2, 40-67, and Column 6, lines 1-11)

Regarding claim 2, Rowland discloses the claimed limitation wherein accumulating results from performed queries in a record and determining whether the accumulated results exceed any one of the at least one item access rate (See Column 8, lines 46-67, Column 9, lines 1-8)

Regarding claims 3 and 10, Rowland discloses the claimed limitation wherein items subject to item access rates are marked in the database, and wherein any query concerning the items automatically trigger the intrusion detection (See Column 7, lines 55-67, Column 8, lines 1-7)

Regarding claims 4 and 11, Rowland discloses the claimed limitation wherein the step of determining whether an item access rate is exceeded includes determining if the query result includes rows from marked items, and proceeding with the intrusion detection process only upon determining that the item access rate is exceeded (See Column 8, lines 8-23)

Regarding claim 5, Rowland discloses the claimed limitation wherein one of the at least one item access rates defines the number of rows a user may access from a database item at one time (See Column 5, lines 40-67, Column 6, lines 1-11)

Regarding claim 6, Rowland discloses the claimed limitation wherein one of the at least one item access rates defines the number of rows a group of users may access from a database item at one time (See Column 5, lines 40-67, Column 6, lines 1-11)

Regarding claim 7, Rowland discloses the claimed limitation wherein one of the at least one item access rates defines the number of rows that may be accessed from a database item over a period of time (See Column 9, lines 37-51)

Regarding claim 8, Rowland discloses the claimed limitation wherein one of the at least one item access rates defines the number of rows a group of users may access from a database item over a period of time (See Column 9, lines 37-51)

Regarding claim 9, Rowland discloses the claimed limitation wherein the intrusion detection policy further includes at least one interference pattern, the method further comprising: accumulating results from performed queries in a record, comparing the record with at least one of the interference pattern, in order to determine whether a combination of accesses in the record match the interference policy, and notifying the access control system, upon determining that a combination of accesses in the record match the interference policy, to alter the user authorization, thereby making the received request an unauthorized request, before the result is transmitted to the user (See Column 7, lines 41-54)

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Snapp et al. (Distributed Intrusion Detection System) discloses an intrusion system to enhance the effectiveness of monitoring a network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Courtney D. Fields whose telephone number is 571-272-3871. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs. 6:00 - 4:00 pm; off every Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CDF

cdf
June 26, 2005

MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137